arXiv:math/9201238v1 [math.LO] 15 Jan 1992

EXISTENCE OF ENDO-RIGID BOOLEAN ALGEBRAS

In [Sh 2] we, answering a question of Monk, have explicated the notion of "a Boolean algebra with no endomorphisms except the ones induced by ultrafilters on it" (see §2 here) and proved the existence of one with character density $\aleph_0$, assuming first $\diamondsuit_{\aleph_1}$ and then only CH. The idea was that if h is an endomorphism of B,not among the "trivial" ones, then there are pairwise disjoint $D_n \in B$ with $h(d_n) \not\subset d_n$. Then we can, for some $S \subset \omega$, add an element x such that $d_n \in B$ with $h(d_n) \not\subset d_n$¿ Then we can, for some $S \subset \omega$, add an element x such that $d \leq x$ for $n \in S, x \cap d_n = 0$ for $n \notin S$ while forbidding a solution for $\{y \cap h(d_n) : n \in S\} \cup \{y \cap h(d_n) = 0 : n \notin S\}$. Further analysis showed that the point is that we are omitting positive quantifier free types. Continuing this Monk succeeded to prove in ZFC, the existence of such Boolean algebras of cardinality $2^{\aleph_0}$. In his proof he

(a) replaced some uses of the countable density character by the $\aleph_1$-chain condition
(b) generally it is hard to omit $< 2^{\aleph_0}$ many types but because of the special character of the types and models involve, using $2^{\aleph_0}$ almost disjoint subsets of ω, he succeeded in doing this
(c) for another step in the proof (ensuring indecomposability - see Definition 2.1) he (and independently by Nikos) found it is in fact easier to do this when for every countable $I \subset B$ there is $x \in B$ free over it.

The question of the existence of such Boolean algebras in other cardinalities open (See [DMR] and a preliminary list of problems for the handbook of Boolean Algebras by Monk).

We shall prove (in ZFC) the existence of such B of density character λ and cardinality $\lambda^{\aleph_0}$ whenever $\lambda > \aleph_0$. We can conclude answers to some other questions from Monk's list, (combine 3.1 with 2.5). We use a combinatorial method from [Sh 3],[Sh 4], that is represented in section 1.

In [Sh 1], [Sh 6] (and [Sh 7]) the author offers the opinion that the combinatorial proofs of [Sh 1], Ch VIII (applied thee for general first order theories) should be useful for proving the existence of many non-isomorphic, ad/or pairwise non-embeddable structures which have few (or no) automorphisms or endomorphism of direct decompositions etc. As an illumination, in [Sh 6] a rigid Boolean algebra in every $\lambda^{\aleph_0}$ omitting countable types along the way, the method is proved in ZFC, nevertheless it has features of the diamond. It has been used (so in Gobel and Corner [CG] and Gobel and Shelah [GS1],[GS2]. See more on the method and on refinements of it in [Sh 4] and [Sh 3] and mainly [Sh 5].

The combinatorial principle

Content Let $\lambda > k$ be fixed infinite cardinal

We shall deal with the case $cf\,\lambda\aleph_0, \lambda^{\aleph_0} = \lambda^k$, and usually $k = \aleph_0$. Let $\mathcal{M}$ be a function symbols, each with $\leq k$ places, of power $\leq \lambda$. Let $\zeta(\lambda, k)$ be the vocabulary with function symbols $\{Fi, j : i < \lambda\ j < k\}$ where F_i, j is a j-place function symbol. Let $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}_{\lambda,k}(T)$ the free $\zeta(\lambda, k)$-algebra generated by $T \overset{\text{def}}{=} {}^{k>}\lambda (= \{\eta : \eta$ a sequence $< k$ of ordinals $< \lambda$) (We could have as well considered T as a set of urelements, and let $\mathcal{M}$ be the family $H_{<k'}(T)$ of sets hereditarily of cardinality $< k$ build from urelements].

1.2 Explanation. *We shall let B_0 be the Boolean Algebra freely generated by $\{\eta : \eta \in T\}, B_0^C$ its completion and we can interprete B_0^c as a subset og $\mathcal{M}$ (each $a \in B_0^c$ has the form $\cup_{\eta<\omega}\tau_\eta$ where τ_η is a Boolean combination of members of T, so as we have in L $\aleph_0$-place function symbols there is no problem). As the $\eta \in T$ may be over-used we replaced them for this purpose by ?? (e.g. let $F \in L$ be a monadic function symbol, $x_\eta = F(\eta)$).*

Our desired Boolean Algebra B will be a subalgebra of B_0^c containing B_0.

1.3 Definition.

(1) Let L_n, for $n < w$, be fixed vocabularies (= signatures), $|L_n| \leq L_n k, L_{n+1} \subset L_{n+1}$, (with each predicate function symbol finitary for simplicity) let $P_n \in L_{n+1} - L_n$ be monadic predicates.

(2) Let $\mathcal{F}_n$ be the family of sets (or sequences) of the form $\{(f_\ell, N_\ell) : \ell \leq\}$ satisfying
  a) $f_\ell : {}^{\ell\geq}k \to T$ is a *tree emdedding* i.
    (i) f_ℓ is length preserving i.e.$\eta, f_ell(\eta)$ have the same length.
    (ii) f_ℓ is order preserving i.e. for $\eta, \nu \in {}^{\ell\leq k}, \eta < \nu$ iff $f_\ell(\eta) < f_\ell(\nu)$.
  b) f_{e+1} extend f_ℓ (when $\ell + 1 \leq n$)
  c) N_ℓ is an L'_ℓ-model of power $\leq k, |N_\ell| \subset |XX|$,where $L'_\ell \subset L_\ell$.
  d) $L'\ell + 1 \cap L_\ell = L'_\ell$ and $N_{\ell+1} \restriction L'\ell$ extends N_ℓ
  e) if $P_m \in L'_{m+1}$, then $P_m^{N_\ell} = |N_m|$ when $m < \ell \leq n$ and
  f) $Rang(f_\ell) - \cup_{m<\ell} Rang(f_m)$ is included in $N_\ell| - \cup_{m<\ell}|N_m|$.

(3) Let $\mathcal{F}_w$ be the family of pairs (f, N) such that for some $(f_\ell, N_\ell)(\ell < \omega)$ the following holds:
  (i) $\{(f_\ell, N_\ell) : \ell \leq n\}$ belongs to $\mathcal{F}_n$ for $n < w$.
  (ii) $f = \cup_{\ell<\omega} f_\ell, N = \cup_{n<w} N_n$, (i.e. $|N| = \cup_{n<\omega}|N_n|, L(N) = \cup_n L(N_n)$, and $N \restriction L(N_n) = \cup_{n<m<\omega} N_m \restriction L(N_m)$)

(4) For any $(f, N) \in \mathcal{F}_\omega$ let (f_n, N_n) be as above (it is easy to show that (f_n, N_n) is uniquely determined - notice d),e) in (2),) so for (f^α, N^α) we get (f_n^α, N_n^α)

(5) A branch of $Rang(f)$ or of f (for f as in (3)) is just $\eta \in {}^\omega\lambda$ such that for every $n < \omega, \eta \restriction n \in Rang(f)$.

1.4 Explanation of an Intended Plan (of Construction

We will be given $W = \{(f^\alpha, N^\alpha) : \alpha < \alpha(*)\}$, so that every branch η of f^α converges to some $\zeta(\alpha), \zeta(\alpha)$ non decreasing (in α). We have a free object generated by $T(B_0$ in our case) and by induction on α we define B_α and a_α, B_α increasing continuos, such that $B_{\alpha+1}$ is an extension of $B_\alpha, a_\alpha \in B_{\alpha+1} - B_\alpha$ usually $B_{\alpha+1}$ is generated by B_α and a_α is in the completion of B_0). Every element will depend on few ($\leq k$) members of T, and a_α "depends" in a peculiar way: the set $Y_\alpha \subseteq T$ on which it "depends" is $Y^0_\alpha \cup Y^1_\alpha$ where Y^0_α is bounded below $\zeta(\alpha)$ (i.e. $Y^0_\alpha \subseteq {}^{\omega>}\zeta$ for some $\zeta < \zeta(\alpha)$) and Y^1_α is a branch of f^α or something similar. See more in 1.8.

1.5 Definition of the Game. We define for $W \subseteq \mathcal{F}_\omega$ a game $Gm(W)$, which asts ω-moves.

In the n-th move:

Player II: Choose f_n, a tree-embedding of ${}^{n\geq}\lambda$, extending $\cup_{\ell<n} f_\ell$, such that $Rang(f_n) - \cup_{\ell<n} Rang(f_\ell)$ is disjoint to $\cup_{\ell<n}|N_\ell|$; then

player I chooses N_n such that $\{(f_\ell, N_\ell) : \ell \leq n\} \in \mathcal{F}_n$.

In the end player II wins if $(\cup_{n<\omega} f_n, \cup_{n<\omega} N_n) \in W$.

1.6 Remark. We shall be interested in W such that player II wins (or at least does not lose) the game, but W is "thin". Sometimes we need a strengthening of the first player in two respects: he can force (in the n-th move) $Rang(f_{n+1}) - Rang(f_n)$ to be outside a "small" set, and in the zero move he can determine an arbitrary initial segment of the play.

1.7 Definition. We define, for $W \subseteq \mathfrak{F}_\omega$, a game $GM'(W)$ which lasts ω-moves.

In the zero move

player II choose f_0, a tree embedding of ${}^{0\geq}$ to ${}^{0\geq}\lambda$ (but there is only one choice).

player I chooses $k < \omega$ and $\{(f_\ell, N_\ell) : \ell \leq\} \in \mathfrak{f}_k$, and $X_0 \subset T, |X_0| < \lambda$. In the n-th move, $n < 0$:

player II chooses f_{k+n} a tree embedding of ${}^{(k+n)\geq}k$ into ${}^{(k+n)\geq}\lambda$, with *Range* $f_{k+n} - \cup_{\ell<k+n} Rang\, f_\ell$ disjoint to $\cup_{\ell<k+n} N_\ell \cup \cup_{\ell<n} X_\ell$

player I choose N_{k+n} such that $\{(f_\ell, N_\ell) : \ell \leq k+n\} \in \mathfrak{F}_{k+n}$ and $X_n \subseteq T, |X_n| < \lambda$

1.8 Remark. What do we want from W?: First that by adding an element (to B_0) for each (f, N) we can "kill" every undesirable endomorphism, for this it has to encounter every possible endomorphism, and this will be served by "W a barrier". For this $W = \mathcal{F}_\omega$ is O.K. but we also want W to be thin enough so that various demands will have small interaction, for this disjointness and more are demanded.

1.6 Definition.

(1) We call $W \subseteq \mathcal{F}_\omega$ a *strong barrier* if player II wins in $gm(W)$ and even $Gm'(W)$ (which just means he has a winning strategy.)

(2) We call W a *barrier* if player I does not win in $Gm(W)$ and even does not win in $Gm'(W)$.
(3) We call W disjoint *if* for any distinct $(f^\ell, N^\ell) \in W (\ell = 1, 2)$, f^1 and f^2 have no common branch.

1.7 The Existence Theorem.

(1) *if* $\lambda^{\aleph_0} = \lambda^k, cf\,\lambda > \aleph_0$ *then there is a strong disjoint barrier.*
(2) *Suppose* $\lambda^{\aleph_0} = \lambda^k$, $cd\,\lambda > \aleph_0$. *Then there is* $W = \{(f^\alpha, N^\alpha) : \alpha < \alpha^*\} \subseteq \mathcal{F}_w$ *and a function* $\zeta : \alpha^* \to \lambda$ *such that:*

(a) W *is a strong disjoint barrier, moreover for every stationary* $S \subset \{\delta < \lambda : cf\,\delta = \aleph_0\}\,\{(f^\alpha, N^\alpha) : \alpha < \alpha^*, \zeta(\alpha) \in S\}$ *is a disjoint barrier.* *(b)* $cf\,(\zeta(\alpha)) = \aleph_0$ *for* $\alpha < \alpha^*$. *(c) Every branch of* f^α *is an increasing sequence converging to* $\zeta(\alpha)$. *(d) If* $\overline{\eta}$ *is a sequence from* T *(of any length* $\gamma < k^*$*)*, $\tau(\bar{x})$ *a term of Land every* X_i *really appears,* $lg(\overline{x}) = \gamma$ *and* $\tau(\overline{\eta}) \in N^\alpha$ *then* $\bar{\eta} \subseteq N^\alpha \cap T$. *(e) If* $\zeta(\beta) = \zeta(\alpha), \beta + k^{\aleph_0} \leq \alpha < \alpha^*$ *and* η *is a branch of* f^α *then* $\eta \restriction k \notin N^\beta$ *or some* $k < w$. *(f) If* $\lambda = \lambda^k$ *we can demand: if* η *is a branch of* f^α *and* $\eta \restriction k \in N^\beta$ *for all* $k < \omega$ *(where* $\alpha, \beta < \alpha^*$*) then* $N^\alpha \subseteq N^\beta$ *(and even ???* $N^\alpha_n \in N^\beta$ *if* $\mathcal{M} = H_{<k^+}(T)$*).*

Reference

2 Preliminaries on Boolean Algebras

We review here some easy material from [Sh 2].

2.1 Definition.

(1) For any endomorphism h of a Boolean Algebra B. let $EX\,Ker(h) = \{x_1 \cup x_2 :\ h(x_1) = 0$, and $h(y) = y$ for every $y \leq x_2\}$.
$Ex\,Ker^*(h) = \{x \in B :$ in $B/Ex\,Ker(h)$, below $x/Ex\,Ker^*(h)$, there are only finitely many elements$\}$.
(2) A Boolean algebra is endo-rigid *if* for every endomorphism h of $B, B/Ex\,Ker(h)$ is finite (equivalently: $1_B \in Ex\,Ker(h)$).
(3) A Boolean algebra is indecompensable *if* there are no two disjoint ideal $?_0, I_1$ of B, each with no maximal member which generate a maximal ideal $\{a_0 \cup a_1 :\ a_0 \in I_0, a_1 \in I_1\}0$.
(4) A Boolean algebra B is $\aleph_1$-compact if for pairwise disjoint $?_n \in B (n < \omega)$ for some $x \in B, x \cap d_{2n+1} = 0, x \cap d_{2n} = d_{2n}$.

2.2 Lemma.

(1) *A Boolean algebra* B *is endo-rigid iff for every endomorphism of* B*is the endomorphism of some scheme (see Definition 2.3 below).*
(2) *A Boolean algebra* B *is endo-rigid and indecomposable iff every endomorphism of* B *is the endomorphism of some simple-scheme (see Def 2.3 below).*

2.3 Definition.

(1) A scheme of an endomorphism of B consists of a partition $a_0, a_1, b_0, \dots, b_{n-1}, c_0, \dots, c_{m-1}$ of B of maximal nonprincipal ideal I_ℓ below b_ℓ for $\ell < n$, nonprincipal disjoint ideals I^0_ℓ, I^1_ℓ below c_ℓ for $\ell < m$, a number $k < n$, and a partition $b^*_0, \dots, b^*_{n-1}, c^*_0, \dots, c^*_{m-1}$ of $a_0 \cup b_0 \cup, \dots \cup b_{k-1}$. We assume also that $[k + m > 0 \Rightarrow a_0 = 0], [(n - k) + m > 0 \Rightarrow a_1 = 0]$ and except in those cases there are no zero elements in the partition.

(2) The scheme is simple if $m - 0$.

(3) The endomorphism of the scheme is the unique endomorphism $T : B \rightarrow$ such that: (i) $Tz = 0$ when $x < a_0$ or $x \in I_\ell, \ell < k$, or $x \in I^0_\ell, \ell < m$.
  (ii) $Tz = x$ when $x \leq a_1$ or $x \in I_\ell, k \leq \ell < n$ or $x \in I^1_\ell, \ell < m$.
  (iii) $T(b_\ell) = b^*_\ell$ when $\ell < k$.
  (iv) $T(b_\ell) = b_\ell \cup b^*_\ell$ when $k \leq \ell < n$.
  (v) $T(C_\ell) = c_\ell \cup c^*_\ell$ when $\ell < m$.

2.4 Claim. *If h is an endomorphism of a Boolean Algebra B, and $B/Ex\,Ker(h)$ is infinite then there are pairwise disjoint $d_n \in B (n > \omega)$ such that $h(d_n) \not\subset d_n$. By easy manipulation we can assume that $h(d_n) \cap d_{n+1} \neq 0$, and if B satisfies the c.c.c then $\{d_n : n < w\}$ is a maximal antichain. So, an endomorphism of a scheme is a "trivial" endomorphism generated by ideals.*

2.5 Lemma.

(1) *Every endo-rigid Boolean Algebra B is a Hopfian and dual Hopfian. Even $B + B$ is Hopfian (and dual Hopfian) but not rigid.*

Proof Easy to check using 2.2, 2.3.

The Construction

3.1 Main Theorem. *Suppose $\lambda > \aleph_0$. Then there is a B.A. (Boolean Algebra) B such that:*

(1) *B satisfies the c.c.c.*
(2) *B has power $\lambda^{\aleph_0}$ and $T_1(B) = \lambda$ where T_1 is the density character.*
(3) *B is endo-rigid and indecomposable.*

Proof We concentrate on the case $cf(\lambda) \geq \aleph_1$ (on the case $cf\,\lambda = \aleph_0$ see [Sh 5, §2, §3]) we shall use Theorem 1.7, and let $W = \{(f^\alpha, N^\alpha) : \alpha < \alpha^*\}$, the function $\zeta, \mathcal{M}$ and $T = {}^{\omega>}\lambda$ be as there.

We will think of the game as follows: player I tries to produce a non trivial endomorphisms h. Player II supplies (via range (f_1)) elements is $B - 0$ and challenges player I for defining h on them. So player I plays models

N_i in the language L_i with a distinguished function symbol h which is an endomorphism of Boolean Algebras. In the end, as W is a strong barrier, we will get a model $N^\alpha \in W$, in the language $\cup_{i<\omega} L_i$ which includes a function h. We can think of N^α as a Boolean Algebra $\subseteq B_0^c$ with an endomorphism h.

Stage A Let B_0 be the B.A. freely generated by $\{x_\eta : \eta \in T\}$, let $x_\eta = a_\eta$ and B_0^c be its completion. For $A \subseteq B_0^c$ let $\langle A\rangle_{B_c^0}$ can be represented as a countable union of members of B_0, so *w.o.l.g.* $B_0^c \subseteq \mathcal{M}$. We say $x \in B_0^c$ is based on $J \subseteq {}^{>\lambda}$ if it is based on $\{x_\nu : \nu \in J\}$ [i.e.$x = \cup_n y_n$, each y_n is in the subalgebra generated by $\{x_\nu : \nu \in J\}$] and let $\underline{d}(x)$ be the minimal such J. We shall now define by induction on $\alpha < \alpha^*$, the truth values of "$\alpha \in J$",η_α, and members $\alpha_\alpha, b_n^\alpha$, $c_m^\alpha, d_m^\alpha, \tau_m^\alpha$ of B_0^c such that, letting $B_\alpha = \langle B_0, \alpha_i\, i < \alpha, i \in J\rangle_{B_0^c}$:

(1) η_α is a branch of $Rang\,(f^\alpha), \eta_\alpha \neq \eta_\beta$ for $\beta < \alpha$

(2) if $\alpha \in J$, then for some $xi < \zeta(\alpha)$:
$a_\alpha = \cup_m(\tau_m^\alpha \cap d_m^\alpha)$ where $\langle d_m^\alpha : m < \omega\rangle$ is a maximal antichain of non zero elements (of B_0^c) $\cup_m \underline{d}(d_m^\alpha) \subseteq {}^{\omega>}\xi, \tau_m^\alpha \in \langle x_p : \eta_\alpha \restriction m \leq p, p \in T\rangle_{B_0^c}$, and $\tau_m^\alpha \cap d_m^\alpha > 0$.

(3) if $\alpha \in J$, then $b_n^\alpha, d_n^\alpha \in N_0^\alpha$, $c_n^\alpha, \tau_m^\alpha \in N^\alpha$ (hence each is based on $\{x_\nu : \nu \in {}^{\omega>}, \nu \in N^\alpha\}$), and $b_n^\alpha \cap b_m^\alpha = 0$ for $n \neq m$.

(4) for $\beta < \alpha$, $\beta \in J, B_\alpha$ omits $p_\beta = \{x \cap b_n^\beta = c_n^\beta : \eta < \omega\}$.

Remark. Many times we shall write $\beta < \alpha < \alpha^*$ or $w \subseteq \alpha < \alpha^*$ instead $\beta \in \alpha \cap J, w \subseteq \alpha \cap J$.

Before we carry the construction note:

3.2 Crucial Fact. *: For any $x \in B_\alpha$ there are $k, \xi < \zeta$, and $\alpha_0 < \cdots < \alpha_k$ such that $\zeta(\alpha_0) = \zeta(\alpha_1) = \zeta(\alpha_2) = \cdots = \zeta(\alpha_k) = \zeta, x$ is based on $\{x_\nu : \nu \in {}^{\omega>}\xi$ or $\nu \in \underline{d}(\tau^{\alpha_{\ell m}}$, for some $\ell \geq k, m < \omega\}$.*

Stage B Let us carry the construction. For $\xi < \lambda, w \subseteq \alpha^*$ let

$$I_{\xi,w} = \{\nu : \nu \in {}^{w>}\xi \text{or}\, \nu \in \cup_{m<w_{\gamma\in w}} \underline{d}(\tau^{\gamma_m})\}$$

We let $\alpha \in J$ *iff* $|N^\alpha| \subseteq B_\alpha, N^\alpha = (B_0^c \restriction |N^\alpha|, h_\alpha)$ where h_α is an endomorphism of $B_0^c \restriction |N^\alpha|$ hence maps N_n^α into N_n^α for $n < \omega$) and there are $d_m^\alpha \in N_0^\alpha$ for $m < \omega, d_m^\alpha \neq 0, d_m^\alpha \cap d_\ell^\alpha = 0$ for $m \neq \ell$, such that for some $xi < \zeta(\alpha)$ each d_m^α is based on ${}^{\omega>}\xi$, and there are a branch η_α of $Rang\,(f^\alpha)$ and $\tau_m^\alpha \in N^\alpha(m < \omega)$ as in 1),2) above, such that if we add $\cup_{n<\omega}(\tau_n^\alpha \cap d_\ell^\alpha)$ to B_α, each $p_\beta(\beta < \alpha$ is still omitted as well as $P_\alpha = \{x \cap h_\alpha(d_m^\alpha) = h_\alpha(d_m^\alpha \cap \tau_m^\alpha) : m < \omega\}$ and $\langle d_m^\alpha : m < \omega\rangle$ is a maximal antichain.

If $\alpha \in J$ we choose $\eta^\alpha, d_n^\alpha, \tau_m^\alpha$, satisfying the above and let $b_m^\alpha = h_\alpha(d_m^\alpha), c_m^\alpha = h_\alpha(d_m^\alpha \cap \tau_m^\alpha)$.

So "$\alpha \in J$" means that I played Boolean Algebras and cadomorphisms as is the previous remark and we get in the Boolean Algebra with some

The desired Boolean algebra B is B^*_α. We shall investigate it and eventually prove it is endo-rigid (in 3.11) and indecomposable (in 3.12) (3.1(1)), 3.1(2) are trivial).

Note also

3.3 Fact.

(1) *For $\nu \in {}^{\omega >}\lambda, x_\nu$ is free over $\{x_n : \eta \in {}^{\omega >}\lambda, \eta \neq \nu\}$ hence also over the subalgebra of B^c_0 of those elements based on $\{x_\eta : \eta \in {}^{\omega >}\lambda, \eta \neq \nu\}$.*

(2) *For every branch η of F^α such that $\eta \neq \eta_\beta$ for $\beta < \alpha, \xi(\alpha)$; and finite $\omega \subseteq \alpha$ there is k such that $\{\rho : \eta \restriction k \leq \rho \in T\}$ is disjoint to ${}^{W>}\xi \cup \cup\{N^\beta \cap T : \beta \in w, \beta + 2^{\aleph_0} \leq \alpha\} \cup \cup\{\overline{d}(\tau^\beta_n) : n < \omega \in w\}$*

From 3.2 we can conclude:

3.4 Fact. *If $\xi < \zeta(\beta), \beta < \alpha, I \subseteq T$ finite then every element of B_α, based on $I \cup {}^{\omega >}\xi$ is in B_β.*

3.5 Notation.

(1) *Let B^ξ be the set of $a \in B^c_0$ supported by ${}^{w>}\xi$*
(2) *For $x \in B^c_0, \xi < \lambda$ let $pr_\xi(x) = \cap\{a \in B^\xi : x \leq a\}$.*
(3) *For $\xi < \lambda$ let $\epsilon(\xi) = Min\{\gamma : \zeta(\gamma) > \xi\}$.*
(4) *For γ, α^* let $B_{<\gamma>} = \langle\{x_\eta : \eta \in {}^{\omega >}\zeta(\gamma)\} \cup \{a_\beta : \beta < \gamma\}\rangle$.*
(5) *For $\xi < \lambda$ let $B_{[\xi]} = \langle\{x_\eta : \eta \in {}^{W>}\xi\} \cup \{a_\beta : \zeta(\beta) \geq \xi\}\rangle_{B^c_0}$.*

3.6 Fact.

(1) *B^ξ is a complete Boolean subalgebra of B^c_0.*
(2) *$pr_\xi(x)$ si well defined for $x \in B^c_0$*
(3) *if $\xi_0 < \xi_1 < \lambda, x \in B^c_0$ then $pr_{\xi_0}(pr_{\xi_1}(x) = pr_{\xi_0}(x)$.*
(4) *If $\xi < \lambda, w \subseteq T$ is finite then the function $pr_{\xi,w}(x) = \cap\{y \in \langle B^\xi \cup \{x_\nu : \nu \in w\}\rangle : x \geq y\}$ is well defined.*

3.7 Fact.

(1) *For $x \in B_{\alpha^*}, \xi < \lambda$, the element $pr_\xi(x)$ belongs to $B_{[\xi]}$*
(2) *for $x \in B_{\alpha^*}, \xi, \lambda, w \subseteq {}^{\omega >}(\xi + 1)$, the element $pr_{\xi w}(x)$ belongs to $B({}^{\omega >}\xi, w)$.*

Proof We prove this for $x \in B_\alpha$, by induction on α (for all ξ)

Note that $pr_\xi(\cup_{\ell < n} x_\ell) = \cup_{\ell < n} pr_\xi(x_\ell)$.

Case i: $\alpha = 0$, or even $(\forall \beta, \alpha)[\zeta(\beta) \leq \xi]$

Easy; if $x = \tau({}_0, \ldots, a_{n-1}, x_{\nu_0}, \ldots, x_{nu_{m-1}})$ where τ is a Boolean term, $a{-}\ell \in B_{[xi]}, \nu_\ell \in {}^{\omega >}\xi$; by the remarks above w.l.o.g $x = \cap_{\ell < n+m} \tau_\ell, \tau_\ell\{a_\ell, 1- a_\ell\}$ when $\ell < n, \tau_\ell \in \{x_{\nu_{\ell - n}}, 1 - x_{\nu_{\ell - n}}\}$ when $n \leq n + m$, and the sequence $\langle x_{\nu_0}, \ldots, x_{\nu_{n-1}}\rangle$ is with no repetition, then clearly $pr_\xi(x) = \cap_{\ell < n} \tau_\ell \in B_{[\xi]}$;

Case ii: α limit.
Trivial as $B_\alpha = \cup_{\beta<\alpha} B_\beta$.

Case iii: $\alpha = \beta + 1$
By the induction hypothesis w.l.o.g. $x \notin B_\beta$. As $x \in B_\alpha$ there are disjoint $e_0, e_1, e_2 \in B_\beta$ such that $x = e_0 \cup (e_1 \cap a_\beta) \cup (e_2 - a_\beta)$. It suffices to prove that $pr_\xi(e_0), pr_\xi(e_1 \cap a_\beta), pr_\xi(e_2 - a_\beta) \in B_{[\xi]}$, the first is trivial and w.l.o.g. we concentrate on the second. There are $\xi_0 < \zeta(\beta)$ and $k < \omega$ such that e_1 is based on $J \overset{def}{=}{}^{\omega>}\lambda - \{\rho : \eta_\beta \restriction k \leq \rho \in {}^{\omega>}\lambda\}$ and each $d^\beta_n (n < \omega)$ is based on ${}^{\omega>}\xi_0$. By case i, we can assume $\xi < \zeta(\beta)$ hence w.l.o.g. $\xi < \xi_0$, and by the induction hypothesis and 3.6(3) it suffices to prove $pr_{\xi_0}(e_1 \cap a_\beta) \in B_{[\xi]}$. W.l.o.g. $e_1 \cap d^\alpha_m = 0$ for $m < k$ and now clearly $pr_{\xi_0}(e_1 \cap a_\beta) = e_1$ as $pr_{\xi_0}(e_1 \cap d^\alpha_m \cap \tau^\alpha_m) = e_1 \cap d^\alpha_m$ for $m \geq k$, (because d^α_m, e_1 are based on $J, {}^{\omega>}\xi_0 \subseteq J$ and τ^α_m is based on ${}^{\omega>}\lambda - J$ and is > 0)
2) Same proof.

3.8 Lemma. *Suppose* I, w *satisfy:*
$(*)_{I,w} I \subseteq {}^{\omega>}\lambda, w \subseteq a^*, I$ *is closed under initial segments, and for every* $\alpha < \alpha^*$ *if* $\wedge_{m<\omega}(\eta_\alpha \restriction m \in I)$ *then* $\tau^\alpha_m, d^\alpha_m$ *are based on* i *and belong to* $B(I < w)$.
Then for any countable $C \subseteq B^*_\alpha$ *there is a projection from* $\langle B(i,w), C\rangle_{B^c_0}$ *onto* $B(I,w)$.

Proof We can easily find $I(*), w(*)$ such that $C \subseteq W(*)$, $w \subseteq w(*) \subseteq \alpha^*, |w(*) - w| \leq \aleph_0, I \subseteq I(*) \subseteq {}^{\omega>}\lambda, |I(*) - I| \leq \aleph_0$ and if $\alpha \in w(*) - w$, then $\tau^\alpha_m, d^\alpha_m \in B(I*), w(*))$. Let $w(*) - w = \{\alpha_\ell : \ell < \omega\}$, and we define by induction on ℓ a natural number $k_\ell < \omega$, such that the sets $\{\nu \in {}^{\omega>}\lambda : \nu$ appears is $\tau^{\alpha_\ell}_m$ for some $m > k_\ell\}$ are pairwise disjoint to I. Now we can extend the identity on $B(I,w)$ to a projection h_0 from $B(I(*), w)$ onto $B(I,w)$ such that of $\ell < \omega, m > k_\ell$, then $h_0(\tau^{\alpha_\ell}_m \cap d^{\alpha_\ell}_m) = 0$. Now we can define by induction on $\alpha \in (w(*) - w) \cup \{0, \lambda\}$ a projection h_α from $B(I(*), w \cup (w(*) \cap \alpha))$ onto $B(I,w)$ extending h_β for $\beta < \alpha$ and $\beta \in (w(*) - w \cup \{0\})$. For $\alpha = 0$ we have it defined, for $\alpha = \lambda$ we get the conclusion, and in limit stages take the union. In successive stages there is no problem by the choice of h_0, and the k_ℓ's).

3.9 Claim. *If* B' *is an uncountable subalgebra of* $B_{\alpha'}$ *then there is an antichain* $\{d_n : n < \omega\} \subseteq B'$ *and for no* $x \in B, x \cap d_{2n} = 0, x \cap d_{2n+1} = d_{n+1}$ *for every* n *provided that*
(*) no one countable $I \subseteq {}^{\omega>}\lambda$ *is a support for every* $a \in B'$.

Proof We now define by induction on $\alpha < \omega_1, d_\alpha, I_\alpha$, such that:
(i) $I_\alpha \subseteq {}^{\omega>}\lambda$ is countable.
(ii) $\cup_{\beta<\alpha} I_\beta \subseteq I_\alpha$ and for α limit, equality holds.
(iii) $d_\alpha \in B'$ is supported by $I_{\alpha+1}$
There is no problem with this.

By (iii) for each α there are $\tau^0_\alpha \in \langle a_\eta : \eta \in I_\alpha \rangle_{B^c_0}, \tau^1_\alpha, \tau^2_\alpha \in \langle a_\eta : \eta \in I_{\alpha+1} - I_\alpha \rangle_{B^c_0}$ such that $\tau^1_\alpha \cap \tau^2_\alpha = 0$, $\tau^0_\alpha \cap \tau^1_\alpha \leq d_\alpha$, $\tau^0_\alpha \cap \tau^2_\alpha \leq 1 - d_\alpha$.

By Fodor's lemma w.o.l.g. $\tau^0_\alpha = \tau^0$ (i.e. does not depend on α). For each α there is $n(\alpha) < \omega$ such that

$\tau^0_\alpha \in \langle a_\eta : \eta \in I_\alpha \cap {}^{n(\alpha)\geq}\lambda \rangle_{B^c_0}, \tau^1_\alpha, \tau^2_\alpha \in \langle a_\eta : \eta \in (I_{\alpha+1} - I_\alpha) \cap {}^{n(\alpha)\geq}\lambda \rangle_{B^c_0}$

Again by renaming w.o.l.g $n(\alpha) = n(*)$ for every α. Let for $n < \omega, d^n = d_n - \cup_{\ell<n} d_\ell, \tau^n = \tau^0 \cap \cap_{\ell<n} \tau^2_\ell \cap \tau^1_n$, so easily $D^n \in B', \langle d^n : n < \omega \rangle$ is an antichain, $\tau^n \leq d^n$ and $\tau^n \langle a : \eta : \eta \in {}^{n(*)\geq}\lambda \rangle_{B^c_0}$. Suppose $x \in B', x \cap d^{2n} = 0, x \cap d^{2n+1} = d^{2n+1}$. Hence for $n < \omega, x \cap \tau^{2n} = 0, x \cap \tau^{2n+1} = \tau^{2n+1}$. but by 3.8 (for $I = {}^{n(*)\geq}\lambda\omega = \phi$ and $c = \{x\}$), there is such x in $\langle a_\eta ; \eta \in {}^{n(*)\geq}\lambda \rangle_{B^c_o}$, an easy contradiction.

So we have proven that for every $\aleph_1$-compact $B' \subseteq B_{\alpha^*}$, some countable $I \subseteq {}^{\omega>}\lambda$ support every $x \in B'$.

3.10 Claim. *No infinite subalgebra B' of B_{α^*} is $\aleph_1$-compact.*

Proof Suppose there is such B', and let ξ be minimal such that there is such $B' \subseteq B_{[\xi]}$

Part I if (*)

(a) $B' \subseteq B_{\alpha^*}$ is $\aleph_1$-compact and infinite and
(b) $B' \subseteq B_{[\xi]}$
then
(c) for every $\zeta < \xi$ and $x \in B' - \{y : \{z \in B' : z \leq y\}$ is fintie $\}$, there is $x_1 \in B', x - 1 \leq x$ such that for no $y \in B_{[\zeta]}, y \cap x = x_1$.

So assume B', satisfies a) and b) but they fail c) for $\zeta < \xi$ and $x \in B'$, where $\{y : y \leq x, y \in B'\}$ is finite. So for every $z \in B'$, there is $g(z) \in B_{[\zeta]}$ such that $g(z) \cap x = z \cap x$ (use $x_1 = z \cap x$). Let B^a be the subalgebra of $B_{[\zeta]}$ generated by $\{g(z) : z \in B'\}$. Clearly $\{y \in B' : y \leq x\} = \{t \cap x : t \in B^a\}$. Let $x^* = pr_\zeta(x)$, (it is in $B_{[\zeta]}$ by 3.7(1)) and let $B^b = \{t \cap x^* ; t \in B^a\} \cup \{t \cup (1 - x^*) : t \in B^a\}$. Clearly B^b is a subalgebra of $B_{[\zeta]}$, and $1 - x^*$ is an atom of $B^b ; B^b$ is infinite as there are in B' distinct $x_n \leq x$, so $g(x_n) \in B^a$ hence $g(x_n) \cap x^* \in B^b$. As $x \leq x^*$ and $[n \neq\Rightarrow g(x_n) \cap x \neq g(x_m) \cap x]$ clearly $[n \neq m \Rightarrow g(x_n) \cap x^* \not\vdash g(x_n) \cap x^*]$. We shall prove that B^b is $\aleph_1$-compact, thus contradicting the choice of ζ. Let $d_n \in B^b$ be pairwise disjoint, and we want to find $T \in B^b, t \cap d_{2n} = 0, t \cap d_{2n+1} = d_{2n+1}$ (for $n < \omega$). Clearly w.o.l.g. $d_n \leq x^*$ (as $1 - x^*$ is an atom of B^b). So $d_n = t_n \cap x^*$ for some $t_n \in B^a$, hence easily $t_n \cap x \in B'$ so for some $x_n \in B', x_n \leq x$ and $t_n \cap x = x_n \cap x = x_n$. So $X - n = g(x_n) \cap x$.

For $n \neq m, x_n \cap x_m = (t_n \cap x) \cap (t_m \cap x) \leq (t_n \cap x^*) \cap (t_m \cap x^*) = d)n \cap d_m = 0$.

As B' is $\aleph_1$-compact there is $y \in B', y \cap x_{2n} = 0, y \cap x_{2n+1} = x_{2n+1}$. Now $g(y), d_n, t_N$ belongs to $B_{[\xi]}$ and (as $x_n \leq x \leq x^*$):

(i) $g(y) \cap d_2 n \cap x = g(y) \cap t_{2n} \cap x = g(y) \cap x_{2n} \cap x = y \cap x_{2n} \cap x = 0$.

(ii) $(y) \cap d_{2n+1} \cap x = g(y) \cap t_{2n+1} \cap x = g(y) \cap x_{2n+1} \cap x =$

Now by the definition of $X^* = pr_\zeta(x)$, $[\tau \in B_{[\zeta]} \wedge \tau \cap x = 0 \Rightarrow \tau \cap x^* = 0]$. As $(1-\tau \in B_{[\zeta]}, x \leq 1-\tau)$ hence by (i) (for $\tau = g(y) \cap d_{2n}$):

(iii) $g(y) \cap d_{2n} \cap x^* = 0$

Also by the definition of $x^* = pr_\zeta(x)$:

$\tau_1, \tau_2 \in B_{[\zeta]} \wedge \tau_1 \cap x = \tau_2 \cap x \Rightarrow x^* = \tau_2 \cap x^*$ (as $\tau_1 - \tau_2 \in B_{[\zeta]}, x \leq 1 - (\tau_1 - \tau_2)$) hence by (ii)

(iv) $g(y) \cap d_{2n+1} \cap x^* = d_{2n+1} \cap x^*$.

But $d_n \leq x*$, so from (iii) and (iv) $(g(y) \cap d_{2n} = 0, (g(y) \cap x^*) \cap d_{2n+1} = d_{2n+1}$, and $g(y) \in B^a$ hence $g(y) \cap x^* \in B^b$. So B^b is $\aleph_1$-compact this contradicits the minimality of ξ, so we finish Part I.

Part II: If B^1 is $\aleph_1$-compact $B^1 \subsetneq B^2, B^2 = \langle B^1 \cup \{z\}\rangle$ then B^2 is $\aleph_1$-compact.

The proof is straightforward. [If $d_n \in B^2$ are pairwise disjoint, let $d_n = (d^1_n \cap z) \cup (d^2_n - z)$ for some $d^1_n, d^2_n \in B^1$. Now w.l.o.g. $D^1_n \cap d^1_m = 0$ for $n \neq m$-otherwise replace then by $d^1_n - \cup_{\ell<n} d^1_\ell$; similarly $d^2_n \cap d^2_m = 0$, for $\neq m$. So there are $y^\ell \in B^1, y^\ell \cap d^\ell_{2n+1} = d^\ell_{2n+1} = d^\ell_{2n+1}$, and $(y^1 \cap z) \cup (y^2 - z)$ is the solution.]

Part III: ξ cannot be a successor ordinal.

Proof: Let B' satisfy (*)

Suppose $\xi = \zeta + 1$, and by 3.9 there is a countable $I \subseteq {}^{\omega>}\xi$ which support every $a \in B'$. w.l.o.g.I is closed under initial segments and $k = |I - {}^{\omega>\zeta}$ is minimal. Now part I can be applied with $\langle B_{[\zeta]}, \{a_\eta : \eta \in w\}\rangle_{B^c_0}$, for any finite $w \subseteq I$ of power $< k$ instead $B_{[\zeta]}$ (using 3.7(2) instead 3.7(1)). So by applying Part I (to $\langle B_{[\zeta]}, \{a_\eta : \eta \in w\}\rangle_{B^c_0}$) we can add to its conclusion:

d) *for every* finite $w \subseteq I, |w| < |I - {}^{\omega>}\zeta|$ and $x \in B'$ and $x \in B'$ for which $\{y \in B' : y \leq x\}$ is infinite, *there is* $x_1 \in B', x_1 \leq x$ *such that for* no $y \in \langle B_{[\zeta]} \cup \{a_\eta : \eta \in w\}\rangle_{B^c_0}, y \cap x = x_1$.

Now $I - {}^{\omega>}\zeta$ is infinite [otherwise let $B'' = \cup\{a_\eta ; \eta \in I - {}^{\omega>}\zeta\}\rangle_{B^c_0}$, easily it is infinite and $\aleph_1$-compact by Part II and then we apply Part I: for

$I^{\omega>}\zeta = \{\eta_0, \ldots, \eta_{k-1}\}$ and for $u \subseteq \{0, \ldots, k-1\}$, let $x_u \overset{def}{=} \cap\{x_{\eta_\ell} : \ell \in u\} \cap \{1 - x_{x\ell} : \ell < k, \ell \notin u\}$ so $x_u \in B$", $1 = \cup\{x_u : u \subseteq \{0, \ldots, k-1\}\}$, hence for some $u, \{y \in B' : y \leq x_u\}$ is infinite; ζ, x_u contradict the conclusion of Part I.

As B' is $\aleph_1$-compact, for any $x \in B'$ such that $\{y \in \leq x\}$ is infinite, x can be splitted in B' to two elements satisfying the same i.e. $x = x^1 \cup x^2, x^1 \cap x^2 = 0, \{y \in B' : y \leq x^\ell\}$ is infinite for the $\ell = 1, 2$. Let $I^{\omega>}\zeta = \{\eta_\ell : \ell < \omega\}$, so we can find pairwise disjoint $e_n \in B'$, such that $e_n = d_{2n} \cup d_{2n+1}, d_{2n} \cap d_{2n+1} = 0$ and that for no $y \in \langle B_{[B_\zeta]} \cup \{a_{n\ell} : \ell < n\}\rangle, y \cap (d_{2n} \cup d_{2n+1}) = d_{2n+1}$ for every n. So for no $n\, y \in \langle B[\zeta] \cup \{a_{n\ell} : \ell < n\}\rangle_{B^c_0}$.

As $y \in B'$ clearly $y \in B_{[\zeta+1]}$, but y is based on $\omega >\zeta \cup \{a_{\eta\ell} : \ell < \omega\}$ so by 3.7(2) $y \in \langle B_{[\zeta]} \cup \{a_{\eta\ell} : \ell < \omega\}\rangle_{B^c_0}$, contradiction to $y \cap (d_{2n} \cup d_{2n+1})0 =$

Part IV: Let B', satisfy (*) of Part I. by 3.9 for some countable $I \subseteq {}^{\omega>}\xi$, every $b \in B'$ is based on I. By Part III ξ is not a succesor ordinal, so necessarily $cf(\xi) = \aleph_0$, let $Fi(B') = \{x \in B' : \{y \in B' : y \leq x\}$ is finite$\}$. Next we shall show:

(**) for some finite $w \subseteq \{\gamma : \zeta(\gamma) = \xi\}$ and $x^* \in B' - Fi(B')$ for every $y < x^*$ from B', for some $Z \in \langle \cup_{\zeta<\xi} B[\zeta] \cup \{a_\alpha : \alpha \in w\}\rangle_{B_0^c}, z \cap x^* = y$.

Suppose (**) fails and we define by induction on $n < \omega, x_n, y_n, w_n$, such that:

(i) $x_n \in B'$,
(ii) $1 - \cup_{i<n} x_i \notin Fi(B')$
(iii) $w_n \subseteq \{\gamma : \zeta(\gamma) = \xi\}$ is finite
(iv) $w_n \subseteq w_{n+1}$
(v) $y_n \leq x_n, y_n \in B'$.
(vi) for no $z \in \langle \cup_{\zeta<\xi} B_{[\zeta]} \cup \{a_\alpha \in w_n\}_{B_0^c}$ is $\cap x_n = y_n$.

For $n = 0\, 1 \notin Fi(B')$

For every n let w_n be a finite subset of $\{\gamma : \zeta(\gamma) = \xi\}$ extending $\cup_{\ell<n} w_\ell$, such that for every $\ell < n, x_\ell, y_\ell \in \langle \cup_{\zeta<\xi} B_{[\zeta]} \cup \{a_\alpha : \alpha \in w_n\}\rangle_{B_0^c}$. Then as $1 - \cup_{\ell<n} x_i \notin Fi(B')$, and as B' is $\aleph_1$-compact, there is $x_n \leq 1 - \cup_{i<n} x_i, x_n \in B', 1 - \cup_{\ell\leq n} x_i \notin Fi(B')$ and $x_n \notin Fi(B')$. Now as (**) fails w_n, x_n does not satisfy the requirements on w, x^* in (**), so there is $y_n \in B', y_n \leq x_n$ such that for no $z \in \langle \cup_{\zeta<\xi} B_{[\zeta]} \cup \{a_\alpha : \alpha \in w_n\}\rangle_{B_0^c}$. By 3.8 we can easily get a contradicition to (vi). So (**) holds.

Let $t_0, \ldots, t_m \in B_{[\xi]}$ be such that $\cup_{\ell=1}^m t_\ell = 1$ and $(\forall \ell \leq m)(\forall \alpha \in w)\, [t_\ell \leq a_\alpha \vee t - \ell \cap a_\alpha = 0]$. There is an $\ell \leq m$ such that $\{u \cap t_\ell : y \leq x^*$ and $y \in B'\}$ is finite. It is clear (by Part II) that $B'' = \langle b', t_\ell \rangle_{B_0^c}$ is $\aleph_1$-compact: also $X^* \cap t_\ell \in B'' - Fi)B'')$. Now if $y \in B'', y \leq x^* \cap t_\ell$ then for some $y' \in B', y = y' \cap t_\ell$ and w.l.o.g. $y' \leq x^*$, so for some $z \in \langle \cup_{\zeta<\xi} B_{[\zeta]} \cup \{a_\alpha : \alpha \in w\}\rangle_{B_0^c} z \cap x^* = y'$ hence $z \cap (x^* \cap t_\ell) = y$, and by the choice of t_ℓ, for some $z' \in \cup_{\zeta<\xi} B_{[\zeta]}$, the equation $z' \cap (x^* \cap t_\ell) = z \cap (x^* \cap t_\ell) = y$ holds.

So $B'', x** \overset{\text{def}}{=} x^* \cap t - \ell$ satisfy requirements in (**). Now we use (c) of part I. As $cf(\xi) = \aleph_0$, let $\xi = \cup_{n<\omega} \zeta_n$, and we define by induction on $n < \omega, x_n, y_n$ such that:

(i) $x_n \in B'', x_n \leq x^{**}$
(ii) $x^{**} - \cup_{\ell<n} x_i \notin Fi(B'')$
(iii) $y_n \in B', y_n \leq x_n$
(iv) for no $z \in B_{[\zeta_n]}, z \cap x_n = y_n$.

As B" is $\aleph_1$-compact, for some $x^* \in B$", $z^* \cap x_n = y_n$ for each n.

Now as B'', x^{**} satisfy (**), for some $z^{**} \in \cup_{\zeta<\xi} B_{[\zeta]} z^* \cap x^{**} = z^{**} \cap x^{**}$. So for some $n\, z^{**} \in B_{[\zeta_n]}$, contradicting (iv) above. Thus we have finished the proof of 3.10.

3.11 Claim. *B_{α^*} is endo-rigid.*

Proof Suppose h is a counterexample, i.e. h is an endomorphism of B_{α^*} but $B_{\alpha^*} / Ex\, Ker(h)$ is infinite, and we shall get a contradiction.

Clearly if for some $\alpha, N^\alpha = (B^*, h)\, h$ maps $B^* \cap B_{\alpha^*}$, into itself and $\alpha \in J$

omits p_α). So we shall try to find such α which satisfies the requirements in Stage B for belonging to J. We assume $N^\alpha = (|N^\alpha|, h_\alpha), |N_\alpha| \subseteq B_\alpha, h_\alpha = h \restriction N^\alpha, h_\alpha$ maps $N^\alpha \cap B_\alpha$ onto itself, and N_0^α contains some elements we need and somewhat more (see latter). As W is a barrier this is posible. We then will choose η_α, an ω-branch of f^α, distinct from η_β for $\beta < \alpha$ [if $\beta + 2^{\aleph_0} \leq \alpha$ this follows, the rest exclude $< 2^{\aleph_0}$ branches of f^α but there are $2^{\aleph_0}$ such branches], a maximal antichain $\langle d_n : n < \omega\rangle$ of $B_\alpha, d_n \in N_0^\alpha$, and $\tau_n \in N^\alpha$ in $\langle x_\nu : \eta\alpha \restriction n < \nu \in T\rangle_{B^c_)}$, and let $b_n = h(d_n), c_n = h(d_n \cap \tau_n), p_\alpha = \{x \cap b_n = c_n : n < \omega\}$, and $a_\alpha = \cup_{n<\omega}(d_n \cap \tau_n) \in B_0^c$. All should have superscript $\overline{d}, \overline{\tau}$ (where $\overline{d} = \langle : n < \omega\rangle, \overline{\tau} = \langle \tau_n : n < \omega\rangle$) but we usually omit them or write $a_\alpha[\overline{\tau}, \overline{d}], p_\alpha[\overline{\tau}\overline{d}]$ etc.

The choice of $\overline{d}, \overline{\tau}$ (and η_α which is determined by $\overline{\tau}$) is done by listing the demands on them (see Stage B) and showing a solution a solution exists. The only problematic one is (a) (omitting p_β for $\beta \leq \alpha$) and we partition it to three cases:

(I) $\zeta(\beta) < \zeta(\alpha)$ or $\zeta(\beta) = \zeta(\alpha), \beta + 2^{\aleph_0} \leq \alpha$,
(II) $\zeta(\beta) = \zeta(\alpha), \beta < \alpha < \beta + 2^{\aleph_0}$.
(III) $\beta = \alpha$

We shall prove that every $\overline{\tau}, \overline{d}$ are O.K. for (I), that for any family $\{(\overline{d}^i, \eta^i, \overline{\tau}^i) : i < 2^{\aleph_0}\}$ (η a branch of f^α, etc.) with pairwise distinct η^i's, all except $2^{\aleph_0}$ many are O.K. for instance of (II), and that there is a family of $2^{\aleph_0}$ triples $(\overline{d}, \overline{\eta}, \overline{\tau})$ satisfying (III) with pairwise distinct η^i's. This clearly suffices.

Case I: $\zeta(\beta) < \zeta(\alpha)$ or $(\zeta(\beta) = \zeta(\alpha), \beta + 2^{\aleph_0} \leq \alpha$

Suppose some $x \in \langle_\alpha, a_\alpha[\overline{\tau}, \overline{d}]\rangle_{B_0^c}$ realizes p_β. Clearly there is a partition $\langle e_\ell : \ell < 4\rangle$ of 1 (in β_α) such that $x = e_0 \cup (e_1 \cap a_\alpha[\overline{\tau}, \overline{d}]) \cup (e_2 - a_\alpha[\overline{\tau}, \overline{d}])$. Choose $\xi < \zeta(\alpha)$ large enough and finite $w \subseteq \alpha$ so that $[\zeta(\beta) < \zeta(\alpha) \Rightarrow \zeta(\beta) < \xi], d_n, h_\alpha(d_n)b_n^\beta$, are based on $\{x_\nu : \nu \in {}^{\omega>}\xi\}$ (for $\eta < \omega$) and $c_\ell^\beta(\ell < \omega), e_0, e_1, e_2, e_3$ are based on $J = \{\nu \in T : \eta_\alpha \restriction k \not\leq \nu\}$, where $k < \omega$ also satisfies such that $\eta_\alpha(k) > \xi, \eta_\alpha k \notin N_\beta$.

We claim:

(*) there is $m < \omega$ such that $b_m^\beta \cap (e_1 \cup e_2) - \cup_{n \leq k} d_n \neq 0$

For suppose (*) fail, then as $a_\alpha[\overline{\tau}, \overline{d}] \cap (\cup_{n \leq k} d_n) \in B_\alpha$, w.l.o.g. $(e - 1 \cup e_2) \cap \cup_{n \leq k} d_n = 0$ (otherwise let

$e_0' = e_0 \cup (e_1 \cap a_\alpha[\overline{\tau}, \overline{d}] \cap \cup_{n \leq k} d_n) \cup (e - 2 \cap \cup_{n \leq k} d_n - a_\alpha[\overline{\tau}, \overline{d}])$
$e_1' = e_1 - \cup_{n \leq k} d_n$,
$e_2' = e_2 - \cup_{n \leq k} d_n$).

So for every $M < W$, $b_M^\beta \cap (e_1 \cup e_2) = 0$.

So if x realizes p_β then so does e_0, but $e_0 \in B_\alpha$ contradicting an induction hypothesis. So (*) holds.

Now as $\langle d_n : n < \omega\rangle$ is a maximal antichain in B_α, for some $\ell < \omega, d_\ell \cap (b_m^\beta \cap (e_1 \cup e_2 - \cup_{n \leq k} d_n)) \neq 0$. Necessarily $\ell > k$. So for some $\epsilon \in \{1, 2\}, d_\ell \cap b_m^\beta \cap e_\epsilon \neq 0$. As x realizes $p_\beta, x \cap (d_\ell \cap b_m^\beta \cap e_\epsilon) = d - \ell \cap c_n^\beta \cap e_\epsilon$ which is based on J. But we know that $x \cap (d_\ell \cap b_m^\beta \cap e_\epsilon)$ is $d_\ell \cap b_m^\beta \cap e_1 \cap a_\alpha[\overline{\tau}, \overline{d}] = d_\ell \cap b_m^\beta \cap e_1 \cap \tau_\ell$ (if $\epsilon = 1$) or $d_\ell \cap b_m^\beta \cap e_2 \cap (1 - a_\alpha([\overline{\tau}, \overline{d}]) = d_\ell \cap b_m^\beta \cap e_2 \cap 1 - \tau_\ell$ (if $\epsilon = 2$).

As $d_\ell \cap b^\beta_m \cap e - z \neq 0$ is based on $J, \ell > k, \eta_\alpha(k) > \xi, \tau_\ell$ is free over J, (see Fact(2)). Necessarily $x \cap (d_\ell \cap b^\beta_m \cap e_z)$ is not based on J, contradiction.

Case II: $\beta < \alpha < \beta + 2^{\aleph_0}$

We shall prove that if $\eta^\ell, \overline{\tau}^\ell$ are appropiate (for $\ell = 1, 2$) and $\eta^1 \neq \eta^2$ then p_β cannot be realized in both $\langle B_\alpha, a[\overline{\tau}_\ell, \overline{d}]\rangle_{B_0^c}$. (So as $\beta < \alpha < \beta + 2^{\aleph_0}$, there are less then $2^{\aleph_0}$ non appropiate $\overline{\eta}^?, \overline{\tau}^1$).

As there is a perfect set of appropiate η's it will suffice to prove that for each ω-branch η of Rang(f^α) for some appropiate $\tau_1 \langle B_\alpha, a^{\overline{\tau}}\rangle_{B_0^c}$ omits $p_\alpha = p_\alpha[\overline{\tau}, \overline{d}]$ which will be done in Case III.

Note that $I^\alpha_\beta = \{e \in B_\alpha :$ for some $x \leq e$ for every $n\, x \cap b^n_\beta \cap e = c^n_\beta \cap e\}$ is an ideal.

The details are easy.

Case III: $\beta = \alpha$

This case is splitted into several subcases. Let η_α be any ω-branch of $f^\alpha, \eta_\alpha \neq \eta_\beta$ whenever $\beta < \alpha < \beta + 2^{\aleph_0}$. Let $I^* = \cup\{\underline{d}(h(x)); x \in B_\alpha\}$. We shall assume that $|I^*| \leq \aleph_0 \Rightarrow I^* \subseteq N^\alpha_0$, so in this case p_α is omitted by $B_{\alpha+1}$ or B_{α^*} iff ?? omitted by B_α (by 3.7(1)). As acomplishing this aim is easier we shall ?? this case (work as in III 4 and use quite arbitrary p_β).

Subcase III 1.: For some $\rho^* \in T$, and $a^* \in B_\alpha - Ex\,Ker^*(h)$ for every $\leq \rho \in T$ for some $\tau \in \langle x_\eta : \rho < \eta \in T\rangle_{B_0^c}, \tau a \cap a* \neq 0 = h(\tau \cap a^*)$.

As we are interested not in $f^\alpha, N^\alpha)$ itself, but in h, by using $Gm'(W)$, w.l.o.g. $\rho^* \in Range\,(f^\alpha)$. By 3.10 (for $rang\,(h)$, which by assumption, is infinite) ?? easy manipulations (see 2.4 and [Sh 2]) there is maximal antichain ?? $: n < \omega\rangle$ of B_{α^*} such that for no $x \in B_\alpha$, $x \cap h(2_{2n} = h(d_{2n})$ and $\cap h(d_{2n+1}) = O$ W.l.o.g.$\{d_n : n < \omega\} \subseteq N^\alpha_0$

It suffices to prove the conclusion for any ω-branch η_α of $Range(f^\alpha), \rho^* < \eta_\alpha \notin \{\eta_\beta : \beta < \alpha\}$. We define by induction on $n, \tau_n \in N^\alpha_n < in\langle x_\eta : \eta_\alpha \restriction n \leq \eta\rangle_{B_0^c}, \tau_n \neq 0, 1$ and $h(\tau_{2n}) = 1, h(\tau_{2n+1}) = 0$. (possible by the assumption of subcase III 1), so we finish this subcase.

Subcase III 2. For some $a^* \in B_\alpha, \{h(x) - a^* : x \in B_\alpha, x \leq a^*\}$ is infinite.

Clearly $B^a = \{h(x) - a^* : x \in B_{\alpha^*} x \leq a^*\} \cup \{1 - (h(x) - a^*) : b_{\alpha^*} x \leq a^*\}$ is a subalgebra of B_{α^*} (with a^* an atom). By assumption (of ?? subcase) B^a is infinite. So by 3.9 there are $e_n \in B^a$, pairwise disjoint, and (? $x \in B_a) \bigwedge_n (x \geq e_{2n} \wedge x \cap e_{2n+1} = 0)$. As a^* is an atom of B^a w.l.o.g. $\leq 1 - a^*$, hence there is $d_n \leq a^*$ (in B_{α^*}, such that $h(d_n) = e_n$. Clearly $?? - \cup_{\ell<n} d_n) = e_n - \cup_{\ell<n} e_\ell = e_n$, so w.l.o.g. the D_n are pairwise disjoint. So by easy manipulation for some $\langle d_n : n < w\rangle$ the following holds:

- (i) $d_0 = 1 - a^*$
- (ii) $\langle d_n : n < \omega\rangle$ is a maximal antichain of B_{α^*}.
- (iii) for no $x \leq 1 - a^* x \cap h(d_{2n+2}) - a^*$, $x \cap h(d_{2n+1}) - a^* = 0$

We can assume that $d_n, h(d_n) \in N^\alpha_0$.

Let $\overline{\tau} = \langle \tau^0_n : n < \omega\rangle$ be a suitable suquence, (for our η_α) then so are $\overline{\tau}^\ell = \langle \overline{\tau}^\ell\ \omega\rangle$, for $\ell < 4$ where:

$\tau^1_{2n} = 1 - \tau^0_{2n}, \tau^1_{2n+1} = \tau^0_{2n+1};$
$\tau^2_{2n} = \tau^0_{2n}, \tau^2_{2n+1} = 1 - \tau^0_{2n+1};$
$\tau^3_{2n} = 1 - \tau^0_{2n}, \tau^3 2n + 1 = 1 - \tau^0_{2n+1}$

Suppose for each $\ell < 4$, in $\langle_\alpha, a_\alpha[\overline{\tau}^\ell, \overline{d}]\rangle_{B^c_0}$ there is an element y^ℓ which satisfies $y^\ell \cap h(d^\ell) - a^* = h(\tau^\ell_n \cap d_n) - a^*$ for $1 \leq n < \omega$. W.l.o.g. $y^\ell \leq 1 - a^* = d_0$ hence $y^\ell \in B_\alpha$. Now $(y^0 \cup y^1 \cap (y^2 \cup y^3) \in B_\alpha$ contradict (iii) above.

Subcase III 3. For some $a^* \in B^*_\alpha - Ex\,Ker^*(h)$, and $\rho^* \in T$, for every $\rho, \rho \leq \rho \in T$ there is $\tau \in \langle x_\nu; \rho \leq \nu \in T\rangle_{B^c_0}$ such that $h(\tau \cap a^*) \cap a^* = \tau \cap a^*$

Clearly the function $h' : b^*_\alpha \restriction a^* \to B^*_\alpha \restriction a^*$ defined by $h'(x) = h(x) \cap a^*$ is an endomorphism; W.l.o.g. the assumption of subcase III 2 fails hence $\{(x) - a^* : x \leq a^*\}$ is finite, hence the range of h' is finite (as $a^* \notin Ex\,Ker^*(h)$, so by 2.4 there is $x \leq a^*$ such that $h(x) \cap a^* - x \neq 0$; we know that $\underline{d}(x)$ is countable, hence for some $\rho^{**}, \rho^* \leq \rho^{**} \in T, \{\nu : \rho \leq \nu \in T\}$ is disjoint to $\underline{(}a^*) \cup \underline{d}(x))$. Now by the hypothesis of subcase III 3 we can easily find $\tau_n \in \langle x_\nu : \rho^{**} \leq \nu \in t\rangle_{B^c_0}$, with pairwise disjoint $\overline{d}(\tau_n)$ and $h(\tau_n \cap a^*) \cap a^* = \tau_n \cap a^*$. So

$h(\tau_n(\cap x) \cap (a^* - x) = h((\tau_n \cap a^*) \cap x) \cap (a^* - x) = h(\tau_n \cap a^*) \cap h(x) \cap (a^* - x) = (h(\tau_n \cap a^*) \cap a^*) \cap h(x) \cap (a^* - x) = (\tau_n \cap a^*) \cap h(x) \cap (a^* - x) = \tau_n \cap h(x) \cap (a^* - x) = \tau_n \cap (h(x) \cap a^* - x)$

It is $\neq 0$ [as $\overline{d}(\tau_n) \cap \overline{d}(x) \cup \overline{d}(h(x)) \cup \overline{d}(a^*)) = \phi$) and $h(x) \cap a^* - x \neq 0, \tau_n \neq 0$], and for different n we get different values. So $\{h(y \cap x) \cap (a^* - x) : x \in B'_\alpha\}$, is finite. Hence $\{(y \cap x) - x; y \in B_{\alpha'}$ is infinite. Leading to the assumption of subcase III 2(with x here for a^* there).

Subcase III. 4 For some $\rho^* \in T$, and $a^* \in B_{\alpha^*}\, Ex\,Ker^*(h)$ for every $\tau \in \langle_x \nu : \rho^* \not\leq \nu \in T\rangle_{B^c_0} h(\tau \cap a^*) \cap a^*$ is based on $\{\nu : \rho^* \not\leq \nu \in T\}$.

W.l.o.g. the hypothesis of subcase III 1 fails hence $\{h(\tau \cap a^*) : \tau \in \langle x_\nu : \rho^* \leq \nu \in T\rangle_{B^c_0}\}$ is infinite. As also w.l.o.g. the hypothesis of subcase III 2 fails we get $\{(\tau \cap a^*) \cap a^* : \tau \in \langle x_\nu : \rho^* \leq \nu \in T\rangle_{B^c_0}\}$ is infinite. So by 3.9 we can find $d_n \in \langle x_\nu : \rho^* \leq \nu \in T\rangle_{B^c_0}$ such that $d_n : n < \omega\rangle$ is a maximal antichain in B^c_0, and there is no $x \in B_{\alpha^*}, z \cap h(d_{2n} = h(d_{2n}) + h(d_{2n}), x \cap h(d_{2n+1}) = 0$, and $d_0 = 1 - a^*$.

As before we can assume $\rho^* \in Rang(f^\alpha)$ and $d_n \in N^\alpha_0$ for $n < \omega$. We suppose $\eta_\alpha \notin \{\eta_\beta : \beta < \alpha\}$ is an ω-branch of $f^\alpha, \rho^* \leq \eta_\alpha$.

For any suitable τ if $y[\overline{\tau}, \overline{d}] \in \langle B_\alpha, a_\alpha[\overline{\tau}, \overline{d}]\rangle_{B^c_0}$ satisfies $\tau_n \in \langle x_\nu : \rho^* \leq \nu \in T\rangle_{B^c_0}$ and $y[\overline{\tau}, \overline{d}] \cap h(d_n)$, (for every n) then by 3.3 we easily get $y[\overline{\tau}, \overline{d}] \in B_\alpha$, and then get contradiction by trying four τ's, as in subcase III 2.

Subcase III. 5. There are $\rho^* \in T$ and an atomless countable subalgebra $Y \subseteq B^*_\alpha$ and pairwise disjoint $c_\ell \in Y(\ell < \omega)$ such that for every ℓ and $\rho_\ell \in \{\rho : \rho^* \leq \rho \in T\}$ for some $\tau_\ell \in \langle x_\nu : \rho_\ell \leq \nu \in T\rangle_{B^c_0}$, the following holds: for no $x \in B^c_0$ is $\overline{d}(x) \subseteq \{\nu : \rho_\ell \not\leq \nu \in T\}$ and $z \cap h(c_\ell) \cap c_\ell - \tau_\ell = h(c_\ell \cap \tau_\ell) \cap c_\ell - \tau_\ell$.

Let $\langle D_n : n < \omega\rangle$ be a maximal antichain of B_{α^*} such that $d_{2n} = c_{2n}$

So w.l.o.g. $Y \cup \{d_n : n < \omega\} \subseteq N^\alpha_0, \rho^* \in Rang(f^\alpha)$ (using $Gm'(W)$), and even $\rho^* \leq \eta_\alpha$ and each N^α is closed under the functions h and $\rho_\ell \to \ell$

We can now choose by induction on $n, t_n \in N^{\alpha}_n$,

$$\tau_n \in \langle x - \nu : \eta_\alpha \restriction n \leq \nu \in T \rangle_{B^c_0}$$

such that

(*) (a) for even n, for no $x \in B^c_0$ based on $\{\nu : \eta_\alpha \restriction n \not\leq \nu \in t\}$ is $x \cap h(d_n) \cap d_n - \tau_n = h(d_n \cap \tau_n) \cap d_n = \tau_n$.

Why is this sufficient? We let $\overline{d} = \langle d_n : n < \omega \rangle$ and $\overline{\tau} = \langle \tau_n : n < \omega \rangle$. So assume some $y[\overline{\tau}, \overline{d}] \in \langle B_\alpha, a_\alpha[\overline{\tau}, \overline{d}] \rangle_{B^c_0}$ realizes $p_\alpha[\overline{\tau}, \overline{d}]$, i.e. satisfies $y[\overline{\tau}, \overline{d}] \cap h(d_n) = h(d_n \cap \tau_n)$ for every n. As $y[\overline{\tau}, \overline{d}] \in \langle B_\alpha, a_\alpha[\overline{\tau}, \overline{d}] \rangle_{B^c_0}$ for $y[\overline{\tau}, \overline{d}] = e_0[\overline{\tau}, \overline{d}] \cup (e_1[\overline{\tau}, \overline{d}] \cap a_\alpha[\overline{\tau}, \overline{d}]) \cup (e_2[\overline{\tau}, \overline{d}] - a_\alpha[\overline{\tau}, \overline{d}])$.

For some $m(*), \omega, \underline{d}(e_0[\overline{\tau}, \overline{d}]) \cup \underline{d}(e_1[\overline{\tau}, \overline{d}] \cup \underline{d}(e_2[\overline{\tau}, \overline{d}])$ is disjoint to $\{\nu : \eta_\alpha \restriction m(*) \leq \nu \in T\}$ (see 3.3(2)).

Now we compute for n even $> m(*)$:

$z \overset{\text{def}}{=} h(d_n \cap \tau_n) \cap d_n - \tau_n =$

$= y[\overline{\tau}, \overline{d}] \cap h(d_n) \cap d_n - \tau_n$ by the choice of $y[\overline{\tau}, \overline{d}])$

$= (e_0[\overline{\tau}, \overline{d}] \cup (e_1[\overline{\tau}\overline{d}] \cap a_\alpha[\overline{\tau}, \overline{d}]) \cup (e_2[\overline{\tau}, \overline{d}] - a[\overline{\tau}, \overline{d}])) \cap h(d_n) \cap d_n - \tau_n =$

$= (e_0[\overline{\tau}, \overline{d}] \cap h(d_n) \cap d_n - \tau_n) \cup ((e - 1[\overline{\tau}, \overline{d}] \cap a_\alpha[\overline{\tau}, \overline{d}]) \cap h(d_n) \cap d_n - \tau_n) \cup$ $\cup((e_2[\overline{\tau}, \overline{d}] - a_\alpha[\overline{\tau}, \overline{d}]) \cap h(d_n) \cap d_n - \tau_n)$

But $a_\alpha[\overline{\tau}, \overline{d}] \cap d_n = \tau_n \cap d_n$ hence

$$(e_1[\overline{\tau}, \overline{d}] \cap a_\alpha[\overline{\tau}, \overline{d}]) \cap d_n = (e_1[\overline{\tau}, \overline{d} \cap \tau_n \cap d_n$$

$$(e_2[\overline{\tau}, \overline{d}] - a_\alpha[\overline{\tau}, \overline{d}]) \cap d_n = (e_2[\overline{\tau}, \overline{d}] - \tau_n) \cap d_n$$

Hence

$z = (e_0[\overline{\tau}, \overline{d}] \cap h(d_n) \cap d_n - \tau_n) \cup (e_1[\overline{\tau}, \overline{d}] \cap \tau_n) \cap h(d_n) \cap d_n - \tau_n) \cup ((e_2[\overline{\tau}, \overline{d}] - \tau_n \cap h(d_n) \cap d_n - \tau_n)$

But the second term is zero and in the first $-\tau_n$ is redundant, so

$z = (e_0[\overline{\tau}, \overline{d}] \cap h(d_n) \cap d_n - \tau_n) \cup e_2 \cap h(d_n) \cap d_n - \tau_n) =$

$= (e_0[\overline{\tau}, \overline{d}] \cup e_2[\overline{\tau}, \overline{d}]) \cap h(d_n) \cap -\tau_n$

We can conclude

$(e_0[\overline{\tau}, \overline{d}] \cup e - 2[\overline{\tau}, \overline{d}]) \cap h(d_n) \cap d_n - \tau_n = h(d_n \cap \tau_n) \cap d_n - t_n$

contradicting the choice of τ_n.

To finish Case III (hence the proof of 3(10) we need only

Why the five subcases exhaust all posibilities?

Suppose none of III 1-5 occurrs. By not subcase III 1 for some $\rho^0 \in T$,

(a) $h(\tau) \neq 0$ for every $\tau \in \langle x_\eta : \rho^0 J \leq \eta \in T \rangle_{B^c_0}$

Let Y be the $\langle x_{\rho^{0\frown}<i>} :< \omega \rangle_{B^c_0}$. As Y is countable, for some $i(*) < \lambda, \{\nu : \rho^{0\frown} < i(*) > \leq \nu \in T\}$ is disjoint to $\cup\{\underline{d}(y) \cup \underline{d}(h(y)) : y \in Y\}$. As " not subcase III 5" for some $\rho^1, \rho^{0\frown}\langle i(*) \rangle \leq \rho_1 \in T$, and

(b) there are no pairwise disjoint non zero $c_\ell \in Y (\ell < \omega)$, such that for every $\rho^1_\ell, \rho^1 < \rho^1_\ell \in T$ for some $\tau_\ell \in \langle x_\nu : \rho^1_\ell \leq \nu \in T \rangle_{B^c_0}$, the following holds:

(*) for no $x \in B^c_0, \overline{d}(x) \subseteq \{\nu : \rho^1_\ell \not\leq \nu \in T\}$ and $x \cap h(c_\ell) \cap c_\ell - \tau_\ell =$ $h(c_\ell \cap \tau_\ell) \cap c_\ell - \tau_\ell$

Clearly

(c) $\cup\{\underline{d}(y) \cup \underline{d}(h(y)) : Y \in Y\}$ is disjoint to $\{\nu : \rho^1 \leq \in T\}$

Let $Z + \{c \in Y$: for some $\rho^1_c, \rho^1 \leq \rho^1_c \in T$ for no $\tau \in \langle x_\nu : \rho^1 \leq \nu \in T\rangle_{B^c_0}$ does (*) of (b) hold with c, τ instead $c_\ell, \tau_\ell\}$

By (b) among any $\aleph_0$ pairwise disjoint members of Y, al least one belong to Z.

It is quite easy to define $y_n \in Z((n < \omega)$ such that $[y_n \in Ex\,Ker^*(h) \Rightarrow y_n \in Ex\,Ker(h)]$, $[m < n \Rightarrow y_n \cap y_m = 0]$, and for every $y \in Y - \{0\}$ for some $n, y \cap (\cup_{\ell<n} y)\ell) \neq 0$ or $y_n \leq y$. So (by the choice of Y) $\langle y_n : n < \omega\rangle$ is maximal antichain of B^c_0. We shall show $y_n \in Ex\,Ker(h)$; fix n for a while, and suppose $y_n \notin Ex\,Ker(h)$, and let $\rho^1_n, \rho^1_n \leq \rho^1_n \in T$ be such that for no $\tau \in \langle x_\nu : \rho^1_n \leq \nu \in T\rangle_{B^c_0}$ does (*) of (b) hold.

Now for each $\tau \in \langle x_\nu : \rho^1_n \leq \nu \in T\rangle_{B^c_0}$ as $y_n \in Z$, clearly [as (*) of (b) fail for y_n, τ (and ρ^1_n)] for some $x_1 \in B^c_0, \overline{d}(x_1) \subseteq \{\nu : \rho^1_n \nleq \nu \in T\}$ and $x_1 \cap h(y_n) \cap y_n - \tau = h(y_n \cap \tau) \cap y_n - \tau$. Applying the failure of (*) of (b) for $y_n, 1-\tau, \rho^1_n$ we get $x_2 \in B^0_c, \overline{d}(x_2) \subseteq \{\nu : rho^1_n \nleq \nu \in t\}$ and $x_2 \cap h(y_n) \cap y_n - (1-\tau) = h(y_n \cap (1-\tau)) \cap y_n(1-\tau)$; note that $h(y_n \cap \tau) \leq h(y_n)$, and $h(y_n \cap (1-\tau)) = h(y_n) - h(y_n \cap \tau)$. By these equations and as $y_n h(y_n), x_1, x_2$ are based on $\{\nu : \rho^1_n \not< \nu \in T\}$ (by (c) and their choice resp.) clearly for some partition of $1, e^\tau_0, e^\tau_1, e^\tau_2, e^\tau_3, \in B^c_0$, based on $\{\nu : \rho^1 \nleq \nu \in T\}$:

(i) $h(\tau \cap y_n) \cap y_n = e^\tau_0 \cup (e^\tau_1 \cap \tau) \cup (e^\tau_2 - \tau)$.

Now for any $\tau, \sigma \in \langle x_n u : \rho^1_n \leq \in T\rangle$, easily (as h is an endomorphism):

(ii) $h((\tau \cup \sigma \cap y_n) \cap y_n = (h(\tau \cap y_n) \cap y_n) \cap (h(\sigma \cap y_n) \cap y_n)$.

(iii) $h((\tau \cup \sigma \cap y_n) \cap y_n = (h(\tau \cap y_n) \cap y_n) \cup (h(\sigma \cap y_n) \cap y_n)$¿

We can apply (i) to τ, σ and also to $\tau \cup \sigma$, and substitute in (ii) (iii).

We get that

(α) $e^\tau_2 \cap e^\sigma_2 = 0$ if $\overline{d}(\tau) \cap \overline{(}\sigma) =), \tau, \sigma \in \langle x_\nu ; \rho^1 \leq \in T\rangle_{b^c_0}$ (otherwise substitute (i) in (ii) and intersect with $e^\tau_2 \cap e^\sigma_2$) and get $(h((\tau \cap \sigma) \cap y_m) \cap e^\tau_2 \cap e^\sigma_2) = (e^\tau_2 - \tau) \cap (e^\sigma_2 - \sigma) = e^\tau_2 \cap \tau^\sigma_2 \cap (\tau \cup \sigma)$, and $(h((\tau \cap \sigma) \cap y_n) \cap y_n) \cap (e^\tau_2 \cap e^\sigma_2) \notin \langle\{x : \overline{d}(x) \subseteq \{\nu : \rho^1_m \leq \nu \in T\} \cup (\tau \cap \sigma)\rangle_{B^c_0}$ contradiction to (i) for $\sigma \cap \tau$).

So let $\{\tau^i : i < \alpha\}$ be maximal such that $\overline{d}(\tau_i)$ are pairwise disjoint $e^{\tau^i}_2 \neq 0$, and $\tau^i \in \langle x_\nu : \rho^1_n \leq \nu \in T\rangle_{B^c_0}$, then $\alpha < \omega_1$, we can choose ρ^2_n such that:

$\rho^1_n \leq \rho^2_n \in T$, and $[\tau \in \langle x_\nu : \rho^2_n \leq \nu \in \tau\rangle_{B^c_0} \Rightarrow e^\tau_2 = 0$.

Next we can get

(β) $e^\tau - 1 \cap e^\sigma_0 = 0$ (if $\underline{d}(\tau) \cap \underline{d}(\sigma) =$), and $\tau, \sigma \in \langle x_\nu : \rho^2_n \leq \nu \in T\rangle_{B^c_0}$)

The proof is similar to that of (α), using $\tau \cap \sigma$

As B^c_0 satisfies the $\aleph_1$-c.c. we can find $\{\tau^i : i < \omega\} \subseteq \langle x_\nu : \rho^2_n \leq \nu \in T\rangle_{B^c_0}$, such that (in $B^c_0\, e^*_\ell \overset{\text{def}}{=} \cup_{i<\omega} e^{\tau^i}_\ell = \cup\{e^\tau_\ell : \tau \in \langle x_\nu : \rho^2_n \leq \nu \in T\rangle_{B^c_0}\}$ for $\ell = 0, 1$. We can find $\rho^3_n, \rho^2_n \leq \rho^3_n \in t$, such that $\cup_{\ell<\omega}\underline{d}(\tau^i)$ is disjoint to $\{\nu : \rho^3_n \leq \nu \in T\}$. So for every

$\tau \in \langle x_\nu \rho^3_n \leq \nu \in T\rangle_{B^c_0}, e^\tau_0 \leq e^*_0$ (by the choice of e^*_0), and $e^\tau_0 \cap e^{\tau^i}_1 = 0$ for $i < \omega$ (by (β)) hence $e^\tau_0 \cap e^*_1 = 0$, hence

(γ) $e^\tau_0 \leq e^*_0 - e^*_1$.

Similarly

(δ) $e^\tau_1 \leq e^*_1 - e^*_0$.

Now we can prove that $e^\tau_1 = e^\sigma_1$ when $\overline{d}(\tau) \cap \overline{d}(\sigma) = 0, \tau, \sigma \in \langle x_\nu : \rho^3_n \leq \nu \in T\rangle_{B^c_0}$, repeat the proof of ($\alpha$) intersecting with $e^\tau_1 = e^\sigma_1$ when $\tau, \sigma \in \langle x_\nu : \rho^3_n \leq\in T\rangle_{B^c_0}$. So let $e_1 \in B_{\alpha^*}$ be the common value, so

($*$) $h(\tau \cap y_n) \cap y_n = e^\tau_0(e_1 \cap \tau)$ for $\tau \in \langle x_\nu : \rho^3_n \leq\in T\rangle_{B^c_0}$; and $e^\tau_0 \leq y_n - e_1$,

Let $e_o = y_n = e_1$, so $y_n = e_0 \cup e_1, e_0 \cap e_1 = 0$.

So $e^\tau_0 \leq e_0$ for every $\tau \in \langle x_\nu : \rho^3_n \leq \nu \in T\rangle_{B^c_0}$

As $y_n \notin Ex\,Ker^*(h)$, at least one of the elements, e_0, e_1 is not in $Ex\,Ker(h)$¿ As not subcase III 2, for $\ell = 1, 2$ the homomorphism G_ℓ from $B_{\alpha^*} \restriction e_\ell$ to $B_{\alpha^*} \restriction (1 - e_\ell), g_\ell(x) = h(x) - e_\ell$ (for $x = e_1$) has a finite range. Hence for some ideal $\mathcal{J}$ of $B^c_0 y_n/\mathcal{J}$ is a finite union of atoms and

for every $\tau \in e\langle x_\nu : \rho^3_n \leq \nu \in T\rangle \cap \mathcal{J}$

for $\ell = 0, 1 h(\tau \cap y_n) \cap e_\ell = h(\tau \cap e_\ell) \cap e_\ell$

hence $h(\tau \cap e_\ell) \cap e_\ell = (e^\tau_0 \cup (e^\tau_1 \cap \tau)) \cap e_\ell$.

So (for $\tau \in \langle x_\nu : \rho^3_n \leq \nu \in T\rangle_{B^c_0} \cap \mathcal{J}$:

$h(\tau \cap e_0) \cap e_0 = e^\tau_0$

$h(\tau \cap e_1) \cap e_1 = \tau \cap e_1$

If $e - 1 \notin Ex\,Ker(h)$, we get contradicition to "not subcase 3" [use ρ^3_n for ρ^* there, now for any $\rho, p^3_n \leq \rho \in T$ choose pairwise disjoint $\tau_\ell \in \langle x_\nu : \rho \leq\in T\rangle_{B^c_0}$ for $\ell < \omega$ by the choice of $\mathcal{J}$ for at least one $\ell, \tau_\ell \in \mathcal{J}$, so τ_ℓ is as requires there]. So assume $e_0 \notin Ker\,Ker^*(h)$ and get contradiction to "not subcase III 4" [for some $\ell < m < \omega x_{\rho^{3\frown}_n<\ell>} - x_{\rho^{3\frown}_n<n>}$) for ρ^*, a^* with α large enough].

So for each $n, y_n \in Ex\,Ker(h)$, by their choice) so let $y_n = y^0_n \cup y^1_n$ (both in B_{α^*}), $h(y^0_n) = 0, h(x) = x$ for $x \leq y^1_n, x \in B_{\alpha^*}$. Let $I \subseteq T$ be a countable set such that $\underline{d}(y^0_n), \underline{d}(y^1_n) \subseteq I$, and for $x- \in B_{\alpha^*}\ \underline{d}(h(x - y_n) \cap y_n) \subseteq I$ (by "not subcase III 2", for each n we have only finitely many elements of this form).

We can easily show that for every $x \in B_{\alpha^*}$, for some $\alpha \in B^c_0$ based on I, $h(x) - x = a - x$, [as $\langle y_n : n < \omega\rangle$ is a maximal antichain in B_{α^*}, for this it suffices to show for every $n < \omega$ there is $a_n \in B^c_{\alpha^*}, a_n \leq y_n$ such that $(h(x) - x) \cap y_n = a_n - x$; but $(h(x) - x) \cap y_n$ is the union of $(h(x \cap (y_n) - x \cap y_n$ which is zeto as $(\forall_z \leq y_n) h(z) \leq z$ and of $(h(x - y_n) - x) \cap y_n$ which we know is bsed as wanted]. so $h(x) = e^x_0 \cup (e^x_1 \cap x) \cup e^x_2 - x)$ where each e^x_ℓ is based on $I, \langle e^x_\ell : \ell < 4\rangle$ pairwise disjoint $e^*_\ell \in B^c_0$. As in the analysis above of $h(x \cap y_n) \cap y_n$, (possibly with increasing I) applied to $x \in B_{\alpha^*}$ with $\underline{d}(x) \cap I = 0$, we get $e^x_2 = 0, e^x_1 = e_1$. If $e_1 \notin Ex\,Ker^*(h)$ we get contradiction to "not subcase III 3". So $1 - e_1 \notin Ex\,Ker^*(h)$ and apply "not subcase III 4".

So we finish the proof of 3.11; so B_{α^*} is endo-rigid.

Lemma. *B_{α^*} is indecomposable.*

Proof Suppose K_0, K_1 are disjoint ideals of B_{α^*}, each with no maximal members, which generate a maximal ideal of B_{α^*}. For $\ell = 1, 2$ let $\{d^\ell_n : \ell < \omega\}$ be a maximal antichain $\subseteq K_\ell$ (they are countable as B_{α^*} satisfies the c.c.c., and may be chosen infinite as $K_\ell \neq \{0\}, b_{\alpha^*}$ is atomless). Let K be the ideal $K_0 \cup K_1$ generates.

Now, e.g. for some $\xi, \lambda, \{d^\ell_n : \ell < 2, n, \omega\} \subseteq B_\xi$. Clearly $a_{<\xi>} = b^0 \cup b^1, b^\ell \in K_\ell$. Now $pr_\xi(b^\ell) \in B_{[\xi]}$ and is disjoint to each $d^{1-\ell}_n : n < \omega\}, pr_\xi(b^\ell)$ is disjoint to every member of $K_{1-\ell}$. As $K - 0 \cup K_1$ generate a maximal ideal, clearly $pr_\xi(b^\ell) \in K_\ell$ [otherwise $pr_\xi(b^\ell) = 1 - c^1 \cup c^2$, for some $c^1 \in K_1, c^2 \in K_2$, and then $c^{1-\ell}$ is necessarily a maximal member of $K_{1-\ell}$, so $K_{1-\ell}$ is principal contradiction]. So $pr_\xi(B^0) \cup pr_\xi(b^2) < 1$ but $1 = pr_\xi(a_{<\xi>} = \cup^2_{\ell=0} pr_\xi(b^\ell)$ contrdiction.

3.13 Theorem. *In 3.1 we can get $2\lambda^{\aleph_0}$ such Boolean Algebras such that any homomorphism from one to the other has a finite range.*

Proof Left to the reader (see [Sh 4.3]).

References

[CG] A.L.S. Corner and R. Gobel, *Presenting endomorphism algebras- a uniform treatment*, Proc. London Math Soc..

[DMR] E. K. van Douwen, J.D. Monk and M. Rabin, *Some questions about Boolean algebras*, Algebra Universatis **11** (1980), 220-243.

[GS1] R. Gobel and S. Shelah, *Modules over arbitray domains,I*, Math Zeitschift.

[GS2] ———, *Modules over arbitray domain,II*, Fund. Math.

[M] J.D. Monk, *A very rigid Boolean algebra*, Israel J. Math no 35 (1980), 135-150.

[Sh1] S. Shelah, *Clasification Theory and the number of non isomorphic models,* (1978).

[Sh2] ———, *Boolean algebras with few endomorphisms*, Proc of A.M.S. no 14 (1979), 135-142.

[Sh3] ———, *Existence of rigid like families of abelian p-groups*, . Model Theory and Algebra (1975), 385-402.

[Sh4] ———, *A combinatorial principle and endomorphism rings of p-groups I Proc of the Jerusalem model theory year*, Israel J. Math.

[Sh5] ———, *A combinatorial principle and endomorphism rings of abelian groups II, Proc of the Conference on Abelian groups* (April 1984), Iudine,Italy.

[Sh6] ———, *Why there are many non-isomorphic models of unsuperstable theoreies,*, Proc. of the International Congress of Math ,Vancouver (1974 pages 553-557).

[Sh7] ———, *Abstract of A.M.S.* (1984).